

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 JERRY PROFFITT,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 JOE LAZARRAG, Warden,

15 Respondent.  
16

No. 2:20-cv-00667 GGH P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas  
18 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis  
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

20 Examination of the in forma pauperis affidavit reveals that petitioner is unable to afford  
21 the costs of suit. Accordingly, the request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is  
22 granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Petitioner's second request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF  
23 No. 6) will be denied as duplicative.

24 Petitioner challenges his 2001 conviction in the Shasta County Superior Court for charges  
25 pursuant to Cal. Penal Code § 288 (lewd and lascivious acts with a minor child) and § 288.5  
26 (continuous sexual abuse of a minor). ECF No. 1. The court's records reveal that petitioner has  
27 previously filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus attacking the conviction and sentence

28 ///

1 challenged in this case.<sup>1</sup> The previous application was filed on September 27, 2006 and was  
2 dismissed as barred by the statute of limitations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) on September  
3 27, 2007. See Proffitt v. Campbell, 2:06-cv-02143-GEB-GGH, ECF Nos. 1, 101, 104, 105.

4 Before petitioner can proceed with the instant application, he must move in the United States  
5 Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for an order authorizing the district court to consider the  
6 application. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3). Therefore, petitioner's application must be dismissed  
7 without prejudice to its re-filing upon obtaining authorization from the United States Court of  
8 Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

9 Due to the court's recommendation that petitioner's federal habeas petition be dismissed  
10 as second or successive, petitioner's motion to appoint counsel (ECF No. 3) and motion to attend  
11 oral argument (ECF No. 8) are denied as moot.

12 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

13 1. Petitioner's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is GRANTED;

14 2. Petitioner's second application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 6) is DENIED  
15 as duplicative;

16 3. Petitioner's motion to appoint counsel (ECF No. 3) and motion to attend oral argument  
17 (ECF No. 8) are DENIED as moot; and

18 4. The Clerk of the Court shall assign this case to a district judge.

19 Further, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed as a second or  
20 successive habeas corpus application without prejudice to its refiling with a copy of an order from  
21 the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals authorizing petitioner to file a successive petition.

22 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
23 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days  
24 after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written

25 ///

26 ///

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> The court may take judicial notice of court records in other cases. United States v. Howard, 381  
F.3d 873, 876 n.1 (9th Cir. 2004).

1 objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s  
2 Findings and Recommendations.” Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the  
3 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
4 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 Dated: April 20, 2020

6 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28